

recite a stop mechanism and a neutral support mechanism, both coupled between the first arm and the second arm. Applicants' specification discloses a neutral support stop mechanism that is both a stop mechanism and a neutral support mechanism. First, this mechanism is a stop mechanism that allows the platform to be positioned at an infinite number of positions above the base. In addition, this mechanism is also an internal force producing device that can be adjusted to produce a variable amount of upward force on the platform to allow computer components having a variety of weights to be supported by the workstation. While only one device is illustrated, applicants' specification contemplates the use of separate neutral support and stop mechanisms. (See applicants' specification, pg. 14, lines 17-19). Therefore, because applicants' specification makes it clear that two separate devices could be utilized to replace the single, dual function illustrated device, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 3, 4, and 11.

Regarding claims 7 and 13, applicants have amended these claims to provide sufficient antecedent basis for all claim limitations and to better define the scope of the invention, thus clarifying the subject matter being claimed. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph objection of claims 7 and 13.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Birrell. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to better distinguish the claimed invention from what is disclosed in Birrell and to prevent the claimed invention from being misread onto the same. In particular, applicants' amended claim 1 recites a line passing through the upper end and lower end of the second arm that is oriented at an acute angle greater than zero with respect to a vertical line passing through the base.

A

Conversely, Birrell does not show a second arm that is oriented at an acute angle greater than zero with respect to a vertical line passing through the base. Instead, Birrell shows a second arm (support column 15) including a pair of sloped cross panels. Applicants assert that the shape or orientation of these cross panels is not relevant to the intended meaning of Applicants' claims. Because Birrell does not show every feature recited in applicants' independent claim 1, specifically a second arm that is oriented at an acute angle greater than zero with respect to a vertical line passing through the base, it cannot support a proper §102(b) rejection of claims 1-6. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

In light of the above comments and with respect to claim 6, applicants' claim recites the at least one platform being closer to a vertical line passing through a center of the base when the first arm is at a second angular position than when the first arm is at a first angular position. As recited in claim 1, the at least one platform is a greater distance from the base when the first arm is in the second angular position than when the first arm is in the first angular position. However, the keyboard platform identified in Birrell appears to be closer to a vertical line passing through the center of the base when it is at a lower position than when it is at a raised position. Because Birrell does not show every feature recited in applicants' claim, it cannot support a proper §102 rejection of the same. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the same, over and above the reasons set forth above.

Claims 7, 10-13, 16, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Birrell. Regarding claims 7 and 13, applicants' claims recite a hinged monitor

A

support included on said at least one platform, wherein the monitor support is movable between a first monitor angle and a second monitor angle. However, Birrell neither shows nor suggests a platform having a monitor support that is hinged and movable between a first monitor angle and a second monitor angle. Because Birrell does not show or contemplate every feature recited in claims 7 and 13, it cannot support either a proper §102(e) or §103(a) rejection of the same. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of claims 7 and 13 over and above the reasons set forth for claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 10-13 and 16, applicants have amended independent claim 10 to better distinguish the claimed invention from what is disclosed in Birrell and to prevent the claimed invention from being misread onto the same. In particular, applicants' amended claim 10 recites a line passing through the upper end and lower end of the second arm that is oriented at an acute angle greater than zero with respect to a vertical line passing through the base. Conversely, as set forth with respect to applicants' claim 1, Birrell does not show a second arm in which a line passing through its upper and lower ends that is oriented at an acute angle greater than zero with respect to a vertical line passing through the base. Once again, applicants assert that the shape or orientation of the cross panels is irrelevant to the patentability of applicants' claimed invention. Because Birrell does not show every feature recited in applicants' independent claim 10, it cannot support a proper §102(e) rejection of claims 10-13 and 16. Further, because Birrell does not contemplate or suggest every feature recited in applicants' claims, it cannot support a proper §103(a) rejection of claims 10-13 and 16.

A

In light of the above comments and with respect to claim 12, applicants' claim recites the at least one platform being closer to a vertical line passing through a center of the base when the first arm is at the second angular position than when the first arm is at the first angular position, wherein the platform is a greater distance from the base when the first arm is in the second angular position than when the first arm is in the first angular position. As set forth above with respect to applicants' claim 6, Birrell does not show this feature of applicants' claimed invention. Further, this feature is neither contemplated nor suggested by Birrell. Because Birrell does not show or contemplate every feature recited in applicants' claims, it cannot form the basis for either a proper §102(e) or a §103(a) rejection of claim 12. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of claim 12 over and above the reasons set forth above.

In light of the above comments and with respect to claim 16, it recites a security panel that is attached to the at least one platform, wherein the security panel at least partially covers at least one of a computer input device and a computer output device. Birrell neither shows nor contemplates the addition of a security panel attached to the at least one platform that partially covers at least one of a computer input device and a computer output device. Because Birrell neither shows nor contemplates all of the features recited in applicants' claim 16, it cannot support either a proper §102(e) or a proper §103(a) rejection of the same. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of claim 16 over and above the reasons set forth above.

Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Birrell in view of Coulthard. Applicants' independent claims

AK

1, 10 and 17, from which the rejected claims depend, recite that a line passing through the upper end and lower end of the second arm is oriented at an acute angle greater than zero with respect to a vertical line passing through the base. As set forth above, Birrell does not show this feature of applicants' claimed invention. In addition, this feature is neither suggested nor contemplated by Birrell. Because this feature is likewise not taught by Coulthard, modification of Birrell in light of Coulthard does not result in the invention recited in applicants' claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 19 and 20. Because the combination of Birrell and Coulthard suggested in the Office Action does not result in a device having all of the features recited in applicants' claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 19 and 20, these references cannot form the basis of a proper §103(a) rejection of the same. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 19 and 20.

In light of the above comments and with respect to claim 20, applicants' claim recites the at least one platform being closer to a vertical line passing through a center of the base when the first arm is at a second angular position than when the first arm is at a first angular position. As recited in independent claim 17, the platform is a greater distance from the base when the first arm is in the second angular position than when the first arm is in the first angular position. As set forth above with respect to claims 6 and 12, Birrell neither suggests nor contemplates a platform that is closer to a vertical line running through the center of the base when the platform is at a raised position than when the platform is at a lowered position. Further, modification of Birrell in light of the teachings of Coulthard does not result in a device having this feature recited in applicants' claim 20. Because combination of Birrell and Coulthard in the manner suggested by the Office Action

A

does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in applicants' claim 20, these references cannot form the basis of a proper §103(a) rejection of the same. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 20 over and above the reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing amendment and response, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 1 and 3-20. If, however, the examiner believes some additional minor clarification would put this case in even better condition for allowance, she is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355, in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael B. McNeil

Reg. No: 35, 949

A